UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,880	08/17/2005	Matthias Dammers	3988-045910	7396
	7590 06/09/200 AW FIRM, P.C.	EXAMINER		
700 KOPPERS BUILDING			ELOSHWAY, NIKI MARINA	
436 SEVENTH AVENUE PITTSBURGH, PA 15219			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3781	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/519,880	DAMMERS, MATTHIAS	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NIKI M. ELOSHWAY	3781	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IDENTIFY OF THE MAILING I	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION I.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to divide apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON	ON. imely filed m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22. This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is FINAL . Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, p		
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 25-50 is/are pending in the applicati 4a) Of the above claim(s) 36-45 is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 25-35, 46-50 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	awn from consideration. /or election requirement.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according to the drawing and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	ecepted or b) objected to by the e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bure. * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applica iority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ition No ved in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date	

Application/Control Number: 10/519,880 Page 2

Art Unit: 3781

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Election/Restrictions

- 2. Claims 36-45 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on April 22, 2009.
- 3. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 25-35 and 46-50 in the reply filed on April 22, 2009 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claims 25, 26, 28, 34, 35 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gordon et al. (U.S. 5,156,295). Gordon et al. teach a cap, shown in figures 4 and 5, for a laminated carton packaging, shown in figure 8, wherein the cap is constructed of plastic, as disclosed in col. 3 lines 22-26. A spout element 64 having a screw thread 74 and a spout opening designed to be closed by a screw cap 78. Regarding the limitation that the spout element is deep drawn, it has been held that "even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is

based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon et al. (U.S. 5,156,295) in view of Kennedy (U.S. 4,643,330). Gordon et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the threads being interrupted. Kennedy teaches that it is known to provide a spout with interrupted threads (see element 32). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the cap assembly of Gordon et al. with the threads being interrupted, as taught by Kennedy, in order to allow for drainage of moisture from the area between the spout and cap, as disclosed in Kennedy.
- 8. Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon et al. (U.S. 5,156,295) in view of DE3832412. Gordon et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the plastic being a multilayer foil. DE3832412 teaches that it is known to provide a spout made of multilayer foil. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the cap assembly of Gordon et al. with the material being a multilayer foil, as taught by DE3832412, in order to provide the spout with gas barrier layers.

Application/Control Number: 10/519,880

Art Unit: 3781

Page 4

9. Claims 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon et al. (U.S.

5,156,295) in view of Hargraves et al. (U.S. 4,966,780). Gordon et al. disclose the claimed invention

except for the angled edge, outward pitch and downward tapering periphery. Hargraves et al. teach that it

is known to provide a cap with and angled edge, outward pitch and downward tapering periphery (see

figure 1A). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to provide the cap assembly of Gordon et al. with the cap having an angled edge, an outward

pitch and downward tapering periphery, as taught by Hargraves et al., in order to allow the cap to be used

as a measuring cup.

- Claims 47, 49 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon et 10. al. (U.S. 5,156,295) in view of Bouraoui et al. (U.S. 5,848,748). Gordon et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the plastic and aluminum layers of the packaging body. Bouraoui et al. teach that it is known to provide a packaging body with a carton/plastic/aluminum laminate (see col. 4 line 61 through col. 5 line 7). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the package assembly of Gordon et al. with the packaging body being made of a carton/plastic/aluminum laminate, as taught by Bouraoui et al., in order to construct a package which has a moisture barrier and gas barrier.
- 11. Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon et al. (U.S. 5,156,295) in view of Bouraoui et al. (U.S. 5,848,748) and DE 3308112. Gordon et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the plastic and aluminum layers of the packaging body and the plastic bottom. Bouraoui et al. teach that it is known to provide a packaging body with a carton/plastic/aluminum laminate (see col. 4 line 61 through col. 5 line 7). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the package assembly of Gordon et al. with the packaging body being made of a carton/plastic/aluminum laminate, as taught by Bouraoui et al., in order to construct a package which has a moisture barrier and gas barrier.

Application/Control Number: 10/519,880 Page 5

Art Unit: 3781

DE 3308112 teaches that it is known to provide a packaging body with a plastic bottom. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the modified package assembly of Gordon et al. with a plastic bottom, as taught by DE 3308112, in order to increase the strength of the bottom.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The prior art is cited for the spout structure.

13. THIS ACTION IS NON-FINAL.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to NIKI M. ELOSHWAY whose telephone number is (571)272-4538. The examiner can

normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Anthony Stashick can be reached on 571-272-4561. The fax phone number for the organization where

this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available

through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer

Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR

CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Niki M. Eloshway/ Niki M. Eloshway Application/Control Number: 10/519,880 Page 6

Art Unit: 3781

Examiner Art Unit 3781

NME